California MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team Summary of the October 13-14, 2010 Meeting of the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT)

Revised November 5, 2010

Meeting Date, Time and Place

Wednesday, October 13, 2010 1:00 p.m. – 5:00 p.m.

and

Thursday, October 14, 2010 8:30 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.

Red Lion Hotel Eureka 1929 Fourth Street Eureka, CA 95501

In addition, the following locations were open to the public to view and participate in the meeting remotely:

C.V. Starr Community Center 300 South Lincoln Street Fort Bragg, CA 95437

Flynn Center Multipurpose Room 981 H Street Crescent City, CA 95531

SAT members attending: Larry Allen, Eric Bjorkstedt, Mark Carr, Dawn Goley, Dominic Gregorio, Ron LeValley, Steven Morgan, Steve Murray, Karina Nielsen, Astrid Scholz, Craig Strong, and Steve Wertz.

SAT members absent: Chris Costello, Kevin Fleming, Steve Gaines, David Hankin, John Largier, Phillip Levin, Pete Raimondi, Steven Rumrill, and Will White.

Meeting Objectives

- Receive updates on the MLPA North Coast Study Region (NCSR) marine protected area (MPA) planning process
- Review and potentially approve SAT responses to science questions
- Review and potentially approve new proposed levels of protection designations
- Review and potentially adopt the document, Methods Used to Evaluate MPA Proposals in the NCSR ("SAT Evaluation Methods Document")
- Review and potentially adopt the SAT evaluations of the Round 3 MLPA North Coast Regional Stakeholder Group (NCRSG) MPA Proposal

The meeting agenda may be found on the MLPA website at http://www.dfg.ca.gov/mlpa/meetings.asp

Executive Summary

The ninth meeting of the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team for the MLPA NCSR took place at the Red Lion Hotel in Eureka on October 13 and 14, 2010. The meeting focused on the evaluation results of the NCRSG MPA Proposal developed during Round 3 of the NCSR MPA planning process. The SAT voted to approve all evaluation results, the draft responses to science questions, and additions to the water quality chapter of the SAT Evaluation Methods Document. Additionally, the SAT reviewed existing and new potential levels of protection (LOPs) and voted to approve a number of new LOPs (see summary below). The evaluation results will be presented to the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) during its October 25-26, 2010 meeting in Fortuna.

Meeting Summary

Welcome, Introductions and Review of Agenda

On October 13 and 14, 2010, the ninth meeting of the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team (SAT) for the MLPA North Coast Study Region (NCSR) was held in Eureka.

I. MLPA Initiative North Coast Process Updates

A. North coast planning progress

Ken Wiseman recognized the accomplishment of the NCRSG in developing one MPA proposal for the study region. The NCRSG was the first regional stakeholder group to develop a single final Round 3 MPA proposal to be forwarded to the BRTF. Ken relayed that the MLPA Blue Ribbon Task Force (BRTF) requested that the SAT comment on and discuss the proposal as much as possible during the meeting to assist the BRTF in their decision making process.

B. SAT Tribal Work Group

Satie Airamé gave an update on the SAT tribal work group. The work group has been working with staff on outreach and soliciting feedback from north coast tribes and tribal communities on the Round 3 NCRSG MPA Proposal. Staff also worked to identify a list of species and gear types that the NCRSG could use in their consideration of tribal uses. The list includes only species and gear types that are currently legally allowed in the marine realm. Additionally, the NCRSG approved a motion that says tribal rights should be respected.

II. MPA Design Guidelines and Evaluation Methods for the MLPA North Coast Study Region

C. Review and discuss new proposed LOPs

Mark Carr introduced proposed LOPs for a number of new recreational uses. After extensive discussion, the SAT voted to approve the new LOPs as follows:

High: Other pelagic finfish (any method in waters >50m); pelagic finfish (spear);

Pacific lamprey (H&L, hand, spear, bow and arrow, dip net); eulachon (dip

net); non-living shells (hand).

California MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team Summary of the October 13-14, 2010 Meeting of the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team Revised November 5, 2010

Moderate-High: Other pelagic finfish (troll in waters <50m); sharks, skates, and rays

(spear, harpoon, bow and arrow in non-estuarine waters); trout except

steelhead rainbow trout (H&L)

Moderate: Sharks, skates, and rays (H&L in non-estuarine waters); flounders, soles,

turbots, and sanddabs (H&L); other pelagic finfish (H&L in waters <50m); white sturgeon (H&L); *Porphyra* spp. (Nori, Laver) (hand); *Ulva* spp. (Sea

Lettuce) (hand)

Moderate-Low: Other sculpins, California moray eels, wolf eels, and monkeyface

prickleback (H&L, spear, trap, hand, bow and arrow); shiner surfperch (H&L, dip net, cast net); unspecified finfish (H&L, spear); sharks, skates, and rays (H&L, spear, harpoon, bow and arrow in estuarine waters); limpets (hand); turban snails (hand); octopus (H&L, hand); crabs (traps, hoop net, hand); Chondrocanthus/Gigartina exasperata (Turkish Towel)

(hand); *Mastocarpus* spp. (Mendocino Grapestone) (hand)

Low: Native oysters (hand); unspecified shrimps (hand); unspecified marine

invertebrates (hand); unspecified marine algae (hand)

D. Review and discuss the SAT evaluation methods

Dominic Gregorio presented additions to the water quality chapter of the SAT Evaluation Methods Document. The SAT had indicated that information about dredge spoils should be incorporated into the document, and the work group had drafted text to address the topic. The SAT voted to approve the additions.

III. Science Questions

E. Review and discuss SAT responses to science guestions

Seth Miller presented the draft responses to science questions. The draft responses had already been presented to the NCRSG at its August meeting, but had not yet been approved by the full SAT. The SAT voted to approve the responses, pending some minor edits.

IV. SAT Evaluations of the Round 3 North Coast Regional Stakeholder Group MPA Proposal

- F. Overview of round 3 north coast regional stakeholder group MPA proposal
 - 1) Dominique Monié presented an overview of the MPA proposal under review by the SAT. The proposal has 17 MPAs including six state marine reserves (SMRs). Additionally, the NCRSG chose to recommend seven special closures to accompany the MPA proposal. Dominique also reminded the SAT of the NCRSG motion that traditional tribal uses should be respected. For the SAT evaluations of habitat replication and representation, MPA size and spacing, marine birds and mammals, commercial and recreational fishery impacts, and bioeconomic modeling, the SAT conducted two analyses:
 - a. SAT standard evaluation, which only considers individual MPAs or MPA
 "clusters" (adjacent MPAs at or above a given LOP) that are a minimum size and
 at or above moderate-high LOP; and

b. SAT supplemental evaluation, requested by the BRTF during Round 2 deliberations, which considers both MPAs at or above moderate-high LOP and MPAs below moderate-high protection. MPAs below moderate-high LOP were only evaluated if the only proposed uses that reduced the LOP below moderate-high were those intended to accommodate tribal uses.

G. Review and discuss the marine birds and marine mammals evaluation results

Ron LeValley and Dawn Goley presented the marine birds and marine mammals evaluation results. Overall, special closures play a key role in the overall protection of marine birds and marine mammals, while the MPA proposal provides only a small amount of protection. The special closures do a good job of protecting Stellar's sea lion rookeries but do a poor job of protecting harbor seal rookeries. The special closures also do a good job of protecting a wide variety of breeding bird colonies, particularly at Castle Rock, the second-largest colony in California. The SAT voted to approve the evaluation results.

H. Review and discuss water quality evaluation results

Dominic Gregorio presented the water quality evaluation results. The proposal did very well avoiding areas of water quality concern and co-locating MPAs with areas of special biological significance. Since most MPAs were located far from harbors in the study region, there was a decreased likelihood of co-location with areas of water quality concern. The SAT voted to approve the evaluation results.

I. Review and discuss the potential commercial and recreational fishery impacts evaluation results

Astrid Scholz presented the potential commercial and recreational fishery impacts evaluation results. There is a potential impact of approximately 3% across commercial fisheries, though some fisheries could have higher impacts. The potential impacts for the CPFV fleet are from 4.7% for the standard evaluation to 5.5% for the supplementary evaluation. The SAT voted to approve the evaluation results.

J. Review and discuss the habitat representation and habitat replication evaluation results

Karina Nielsen presented the habitat representation and habitat replication evaluation results. In the standard evaluation (at or above moderate-high protection), the proportion of the study region area in the proposal is 5.9%, and all key habitats except tidal flats and mapped eelgrass are represented to some extent (ranging from 1-36% of available). Less than 10% of all nearshore rocky and soft bottom habitats, and 3 of 4 estuarine habitats, are represented in the standard evaluation; however the deeper soft (7-20%) and rocky habitats (21-35%) are relatively better represented. At least 3-5% of additional available habitat for nearshore rocky habitats, 5-9% of soft bottom habitats, and a relatively smaller proportion of estuarine habitats is included in MPAs in the supplemental evaluation. There is at least one replicate included in the standard evaluation for each open coast habitat, and for most habitats, at least 3-5 replicates already exist elsewhere in the biogeographic region. Six of the 12 key habitats have at least one replicate in both the northern and southern bioregions of the NCSR for the standard evaluation and 10 of 12 key habitats have at least one replicate in both the northern and southern bioregions for the supplemental evaluation. However, seven habitats are not

replicated in the northern bioregion for the standard evaluation (beaches, rock 0-30m, kelp, and all four estuarine habitats), and two habitats are not replicated in the northern bioregion for the supplemental evaluation (rock 0-30m and kelp). The SAT voted to approve the evaluation results.

K. Review and discuss the MPA size and MPA spacing evaluation results

Mark Carr presented the MPA size and MPA spacing evaluation results. In the standard evaluation, the proposal includes six MPA clusters that are above minimum size and none of the MPA clusters meet the preferred size guidelines. In the supplemental evaluation, the proposal includes eight MPA clusters that are above minimum size and two MPA clusters that meet the preferred size guidelines. Regarding spacing, the SAT minimum spacing guidelines cannot be met for three open coast habitats (kelp, rock 100-3000m, and soft 100-3000m). In the standard evaluation, the proposal achieves or approaches guidelines or SAT minimum spacing for rock 30-100m, rock 100-3000m, and soft 30-100m habitats; however all the remaining key habitats have at least one spacing gap that exceeds SAT minimum spacing guidelines or minimum possible spacing. In the supplemental evaluation, five habitats achieve SAT minimum spacing guidelines or approach the minimum possible spacing (rocky shores, rock 30-100m, rock 100-3000m, soft 30-100m, and soft 100-3000m); however, the seven remaining key habitats have at least one spacing gap. Staff will add some information to the slide showing the availability of habitat replicates in the NCSR to allow the BRTF to see where MPAs are located. The SAT voted to approve the evaluation results.

L. Review and discuss the bioeconomic model evaluation results

Eric Bjorkstedt presented the bioeconomic model evaluation results, which compared the NCRSG proposal with Proposal 0, the no action alternative. The NCRSG proposal had highest economic value under unsuccessful management, while Proposal 0 had the highest economic value under MSY-type or conservative management. The model also revealed that Sea Lion Gulch SMR and Ten Mile SMR are particularly important parts of the array. The SAT voted to approve the evaluation results.

V. Wrap-up and Next Steps

M. Other items

Mike Prall confirmed the SAT members attending the BRTF meeting on October 25, 2010, including Mark Carr, Eric Bjorkstedt, Ron LeValley, Dominic Gregorio, and Dawn Goley. Charles Steinbeck from Ecotrust will also be present. The next SAT meeting will be held via teleconference and webinar on November 17, 2010.

Public Comment

Members of the public commented on a wide variety of issues. Since the SAT took action on most agenda items, there were ample periods for public comment during the meeting. Comments were also heard from remote node in Fort Bragg. Most comments focused on specific aspects of each evaluation, though there were also more general comments about the MLPA process and questions regarding the interaction of proposed MPAs and other ocean topics such as proposed military testing and wave energy projects.

Briefing Documents

- C.1: PowerPoint Presentation: Levels of Protection in the MLPA North Coast Study Region
- D.1: Draft Methods Used to Evaluate Draft MPA Proposals in the North Coast Study Region Section 10.0 Water and Sediment Quality (Revised August 24, 2010)
- E.1: Draft SAT Responses to Science Questions
- F.1: PowerPoint Presentation: Overview of the NCRSG Round 3 MPA Proposal
- F.2: Overview Maps of the NCRSG Round 3 MPA Proposal
- F.3: PowerPoint Presentation: of the NCRSG Round 3 special closures
- F.4: Round 3: Description of MPAs in the Round 3 NCRSG MPA Proposal
- F.5: Round 3: Habitat Calculations for the NCRSG MPA Proposal
- F.6: Round 3 NCRSG Special Closures Recommendation: Basic Information
- F.7: Round 3 NCRSG Special Closures Recommendation
- G.1: PowerPoint Presentation: Draft Marine Birds and Marine Mammals Evaluation of the Round 3 MLPA NCRSG MPA Proposal
- G.2: SAT Evaluation of the Round 3 MLPA NCRSG MPA Proposal: Benefits to Marine Mammals
- G.3: SAT Evaluation of the Round 3 MLPA NCRSG MPA Proposal: Benefits to Marine Birds
- H.1: PowerPoint Presentation: Water and Sediment Quality Evaluation of the Round 3 MLPA NCRSG MPA Proposal
- H.2: SAT Evaluation of the Round 3 MLPA NCRSG MPA Proposal: Water and Sediment Quality
- I.1: PowerPoint Presentation: Potential Commercial and Recreational Fishery Impacts of the Round 3 MLPA NCRSG MPA Proposal
- I.2: SAT Evaluation of the Round 3 MLPA NCRSG MPA Proposal: Potential Commercial and Recreational Fishery Impacts
- J.1: PowerPoint Presentation: Habitat Representation and Habitat Replication Evaluations of the Round 3 MLPA NCRSG MPA Proposal
- K.1: PowerPoint Presentation: MPA Size and MPA Spacing Evaluation of the Round 3 MLPA NCRSG MPA Proposal
- K.2: SAT Evaluation of the Round 3 MLPA NCRSG MPA Proposal: Habitat Representation, Habitat Replication, MPA Size, and MPA Spacing Analyses
- L.1: PowerPoint Presentation: Spatial Bioeconomic Model Evaluation of the Round 3 MLPA NCRSG MPA Proposal
- L.2: SAT Evaluation of the Round 3 MLPA NCRSG MPA Proposal: Bioeconomic Model Analysis
- M.1: Summary of the July 28, 2010 Meeting of the MLPA Master Plan Science Advisory Team